



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

States has held that when a corporation, in operation, finds it necessary to recuperate its business and can only sell bonds by giving stock as a bonus, the price given for the bonds is taken as a fair value for both the bonds and stock, and such bondholders are not liable further on the stock. *Handley v. Stutz*, 139 U. S. 417, 11 Sup. Ct. Rep. 530. But see *Morrow v. Steel Co.*, 87 Tenn. 262, 10 S. W. 495. Whether notice to the creditor of the "bonus stock" is material, see *Hospes v. N. W. Mfg. Co.*, supra; 26 AMER. & ENG. ENCY., § 1012. In general on stockholders' liability to creditors, see FROST, INCORPORATION AND ORGANIZATION OF CORPORATIONS; COOK, CORPORATIONS, Vol. 1, § 46; note to *Rickerson Roller Mill Co. v. Farrell F. & M. Co.*, 23 C. C. A. 315; note 33 C. C. A. 23.

COVENANTS—CREATION BY ACCEPTANCE OF DEED POLL.—Land was conveyed to a canal company in consideration and on condition that it construct and maintain a basin thereon. Complainants, the grantors' successors, seek to compel the defendant, the grantee of the canal company, to maintain this basin. Held, the acceptance of the deed-poll did not bind the canal company as a covenantor, nor create any covenant that will run with the land. *Dawson et al. v. Western Maryland R. Co.* (1907), — Ct. App. Md. —, 68 Atl. Rep. 301.

The rule announced in the principal case is supported by the decisions in *Maule v. Weaver*, 7 Pa. St. 329; *Maine v. Cumston*, 98 Mass. 317; *Martin v. Drinan*, 128 Mass. 515; *Hinsdale v. Humphrey*, 15 Conn. 431; *Johnson v. Muzzy*, 45 Vt. 419. However, although the existence of a covenant by the grantee is denied, a recovery is allowed against him in assumpsit on the personal contract. *Parish v. Whitney*, 3 Gray 516; *Kennedy v. Owen*, 136 Mass. 199; *Hinsdale v. Humphrey*, supra. The modern weight of authority seems to be that the acceptance of a deed-poll containing such conditions will create a covenant by the grantee, and if the condition affects the estate the covenant will be binding upon the grantee's successors in title. *Sparkman v. Gove*, 44 N. J. L. 252; *Hagerty v. Lee*, 54 N. J. L. 580; *Atlantic Dock Co. v. Leavitt*, 54 N. Y. 35; *Bowen v. Beck*, 94 N. Y. 86; *Maynard v. Moore*, 76 N. C. 158; *Railroad Co. v. Priest*, 131 Ind. 413; *Hickey v. Railway Co.*, 51 Oh. St. 40; *Railroad v. Reeves*, 64 Ga. 492; *Poage v. Railway Co.*, 24 Mo. App. 199.

CRIMINAL LAW—HABEAS CORPUS—WANT OF JURISDICTION.—Petitioner was indicted for "assault with intent, and in the attempt to kill and murder," under a statute making it equally a state's prison offense to assault with intent to kill or commit manslaughter. (Miss. Code, 1906, § 1013.) The jury returning a verdict of "assault with intent to commit manslaughter," it was held (MAYES, J., dissenting), that the verdict was responsive to the indictment only in finding an assault, a misdemeanor, and that the sentence of the court as to imprisonment was absolutely void, entitling the petitioner to relief by habeas corpus. *Ex parte Burden* (1907), — Miss. —, 45 So. Rep. 1.

A previous decision of the Mississippi court involving the same statute had held that a variance between the specific intent alleged and proved was